

Big Picture Policies
(A) Creation of Water and Wastewater Utilities Oversight Board(s)
Some good ideas could surface, but it can add to staff's workload
Has some possibilities based on LES model and success
I don't know that we need another layer of oversight, the current system is cumbersome enough. Politics should be taken out of the programming of infrastructure improvements. I would much rather see a system similar to the Nebraska Department of Roads, where the legislature has given the responsibility to the Director and his or her professional staff to prioritize and program projects based on established needs criteria.
Should provide for a more consistent, long range view of city's policies
Have to look at advantages vs. disadvantages. How balanced would board be? What would charge/duties be? How long would it take to get board up to speed and then continuity of that knowledge? Would it just add another layer of bureaucracy or be a tool for special interest groups?
I don't know, this sounds sort of interesting
I think an ongoing board would help the utility system similar to LES board
Lincoln has some of the best water at the lowest rates available-lets don't mess it up with a committee. This is not a political issue! Its technical and there is no rational to change.
Over time, these boards will bring the fiscal management and financial skills to public works, thereby freeing staff to concentrate on implementation and service.
I have personally worked to appoint citizens to the myriad of citizen boards that are currently utilized by the city. I find that very few are worthwhile. This would be another layer of bureaucracy that I believe is unneeded. I don't believe that management has been flawed in these areas, necessitating a new oversight function. The need for more money for water and wastewater is based on new regulations and a desire for faster development.
Broader view of the big picture
Paying cash for 50- 100 year life assets makes no sense at all. We don't pay cash for schools, libraries, fire stations, etc. The reason is that the capital cost should be spread over the useful life of the asset. Moving the finance decisions to a board with business/financial expertise could remove some of the politics from the decision making process.
(B) Utilization of Special Assessment Districts
Those who are benefiting the most pay
Will ultimately reduce land prices to farmer and final home lot purchasers. Genesis of level playing field for competing developers
I believe the city could realize some cost savings through the use of Special Assessment Districts, however the design and construction of these improvements need to be constant with the programmed design and construction of improvements. 'My concern is the creation of the Assessment District may necessitate other improvements outside the District which are inconstant with other programmed projects. The requested improvements need to fit in the overall Capital Improvement Plan and Comprehensive Plan.
Predictability and fairness are a big problem with districts
S.A.D have the potential to bring new areas in faster. Can these be used on existing neighborhoods as well?
This is a new taxation method that makes everyone pay regardless of benefit. Farmers are NOT represented on our cost efficiency group.
I'm not very clear about the pros and cons of this
We must take care that the city does not become the banker for developers as it did in the 70's.
Why are we even talking about this? It is how we have built Lincoln. It should always be the first option used.
I have very little knowledge about special assessment districts, but the individuals I know and trust are very skeptical about their outcome.

Way to make all who benefit pay. Not just the one who wants it first
Efficiencies here are possible, but not likely to be large. A willingness to lighten up on some of the paper shuffle required of contractors, and commitment to getting them paid in a more timely fashion would go a long way here.
(C) "Executive Orders" (EO) vs. Special Assessment District Cost
Worth looking at
The differences are already known - need solutions to solve differences
I believe Special Assessment Districts by nature are generally more costly due to size of the improvements. Are not most Special Assessment Districts fairly small and involve only minor improvements? There is cost savings in the volume of work being performed. For example the mobilization cost is the same whether you are placing 500 feet of sanitary sewer or 5,280 feet
Need more information
Again, this is specific and I don't know them
This also
Isn't this already known? Developers do not require guarantees of work and do not require bonding
These are not either/or. They work in tandem. Sometimes an E.O. is more efficient than districts. Generally, multiple owners are better served by districts.
I think this is a valid concern and if it can eliminate disparities between projects, I think it is something worth examining.
Districts cost 20-25% more than EO's - large amount
Landowners abutting improvements which the city is requiring others to pay for should be subject to assessment for benefits conferred by the improvements. It is important to encourage the development of the land shown in the Comprehensive Plan for new growth. Allowing landowners to wait, at no cost, for the city or others to build infrastructure drives up land prices and impedes infrastructure construction. Also, using special assessment revolving fund bonds is another way to utilize the City's tax exempt
(D) Creation of Park Districts
Those benefiting locally pay
May work better over long term.
The cost of parks is small in the overall picture when compared to water, sewer and roads
Need more information
Probably a good idea???
This one needs to be discussed and hear the pros and cons
Take care that admin costs don't out weigh the benefits. What are the benefits?
This is the way for parks instead of impact fees
It is an issue worth exploring, even though I am generally opposed to delineating funding based on geographic area . I would rather not see neighborhoods become responsible for funding parks to eliminate the possibility of socio-economic disparity.
This is a LEGAL way to apportion costs of neighborhood parks. It enables districts to be designated, land for parks to be acquired in advance of development, and further assessments for equipment, etc., made as development occurs. This is a no brainer.
(E) Consistency and Continuity of Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Rules need to be established and then followed. Exceptions should be difficult to obtain
Must be discussed and be market driven with changes as needed.
I believe cost savings can be realized through a planned coordinated design and construction practices. Are infrastructure (Sanitary, Water, Roads, etc.) improvements being coordinated and programmed with definite design , letting construction dates, i.e. a project scheduling system?
The plan has to represent a reasonable financial package in the first place

The plan is a basic road map, not something set in stone. It needs to be flexible
Absolute key to sound, efficient planned growth
Gosh, let's spend all that time and NOT follow it. I think not. The Plan should be implemented as close as possible
.
Good idea. However, the developers must go along.
Savings under this assumption can only occur if public works speeds up the time it takes to design improvements.
I agree with this concept in principle, but know that it would be prudent to hear arguments from those who feel differently.
Flexibility is imperative. Making any part of the planning process more rigid than it already is will be counter productive.
(F) Prioritize City's CIP Projects Relative to Adopted Comprehensive Plan
Eliminate duplication
Purchaser's desires control the market and city's CIP must be sensitive to these influences.
This just makes sense
Absolute key to sound, efficient planned growth
I think this sounds good. Otherwise there is no plan, or it's based on something less objective.
This could be looked at just to see if prioritizing will save money, but not at the cost of efficiency
Isn't this already done? Must stop the outside influence of groups such as developers to change priorities.
This can only work if we have some sort of market trigger in the plan
I think this is a great idea that enhances the value of the Comprehensive Plan for our community.
More "policies and procedures" will not improve efficiency. Flexibility and willingness to adapt to market forces will get money spent in places it is needed.
(G) Moderate Phased Development Called for in Adopted Comprehensive Plan
But don't put too much off for too long
Don't overbuild areas not desired by purchasers
I can see phased development in the terms of the construction of some of the roadway surfacing. However it is extremely important the grading for the additional lanes and right of way be acquired for future improvements today, grade for four-lanes and surface two. The design life for concrete pavement is twenty years; future traffic projections may not warrant the need for four lanes for another twenty to thirty years, the life of pavement. If you delay the purchase of the right of way needed for the fu
Since we are looking at accelerated growth, we should also look at slower growth
Yes, we do not need to overdevelop or overbuild infrastructure.
Sounds like something to look into.
In the current economic timeframes, the more work, especially sewer, done earlier with bonded money will better serve the community
I firmly believe that the amendments adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council are a large part of the reason we are facing a large financing gap. Delaying the development over a longer period of time would make a difference.
Primarily for streets. Even if we had all the money available, it would not make sense to build streets for 25 years' growth over 12 years. Without the population, the land area (and vehicle trips) won't justify the expenditure. This addresses one of the fundamental flaws of the entire infrastructure financing discussion.
If we grow our population at 1.5% per year, there is no way we will use up the land area shown in Tier 1, Priority A, in 12 years, unless there is a shift away from requiring contiguous growth, in which case, there could be scattered development in that area, but it still would not create the traffic volume for 5 lane streets on every section line road.

(H) Policies Governing Infrastructure Projects Not in Conformance with Comprehensive Plan
Establish the rules and then play by the rules
Firm policies are necessary but some flexibility for "good cause" must be available for market driven reasons.
A great deal of planning and public involvement went into the Comprehensive Plan. There would have to be some very unusual compelling reasons to vary from the Comprehensive Improvement Plan. I believe there should be some very strong language prohibiting any variance from the adopted plan.
Makes sense
We should have clear policies, but not roadmaps to circumnavigate the Plan
Good idea. However, the developers must go along.
This is only important if staff does not listen to the market.
If we truly believe that the Comprehensive Plan is our "road map" for the future, then we need to put some teeth in it. I believe, based on the short description, this could do that.
This has not been identified or quantified as an impediment to providing infrastructure. Moreover, City policy has never encouraged such development, and the projects which have been done that might fall in this category have been thoroughly debated and the fiscal impacts have always been part of that debate. It is only in instances where the market forces are very strongly pushing for such development that they have been pursued.
Otherwise, developers do not waste the time and effort to try. As a test of this, try to list projects which were "not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan" which have been failures . . .
(I) Infrastructure Maintenance in Existing Neighborhoods
We can not overlook our older neighborhoods, or else slums take over
Older neighborhoods must be continuously updated in the most cost effective manner.
It always cost more to replace water and sewer than to install new lines. Any savings in these areas would be great
Obviously we're not keeping up. When city attempts to pass bond for crumbling sidewalks, we know we have problems. Similar to Infrastructure element #3 (I) re striping.
Keep up the existing neighborhoods. All neighborhoods will eventually be in this same spot.
This is a priority!
Looks like a good idea. However, what are the options?
The committee has not indicated much concern or identified specific areas that need to be addressed
This is not part of the charge to our committee. However, better care and more efficient delivery of maintenance services would eliminate the tug-of-war older neighborhoods feel about infrastructure financing.
(J) Gravity Flow vs. Force Main/Lift Station Policy for Wastewater
We can not overlook lift stations, but because of cost we should "limit" their use
Temporary (10—15 years) or short term solutions should definitely be considered particularly with developer participation.
The long term benefits of a low maintenance gravity flow system far out weight the short term benefits realized from premature development of an area.
I don't know enough to really give an opinion on this policy
Need more information
I think it's time to look. They are mechanical and that's a problem, but it is the 21st century. Surely, we can make it flow uphill on certain occasions.

I feel this way - we pay good money for our city employees to handle this type of situation. They have the expertise to make those decisions. It should be handled by them.
Would drastically increase maintenance and operation costs! All existing infrastructure is sized for the basin in which it is located. If we change it would require relief sewers all over the city.
This policy change would change too many planning assumptions and would be opposed by planning and public works staff
Based on the arguments I have heard to date, I think it would be an interesting discussion. If the cost savings for gravity flow are significant, we should eliminate the consideration of forced main/lift stations in the future. Perhaps this discussion could quell that debate at the developer/staff level.
If existing sewer capacity can be maxed-out by using lift stations (i.e. going over a ridge line where it is clear that full development of a basin will not utilize all the trunk line capacity), then it makes sense. Likewise, if it can be shown that maintenance costs of lift stations are offset by lower capital costs for trunk lines, it makes sense. Use of lift stations is unlikely to save large sums of money over time. However, that is not justification for an absolute prohibition.
We do have circumstances where lift stations make sense, and the presumption in favor of a gravity system should not prevent rational consideration of lift stations.
(K) Assessment Districts for Rehabilitation/Reconstruction projects– Where arterial streets, sewers, water lines have served their useful life and are worn out, it is rational and fair to assess the properties which benefit from the rehabilitation/reconstruction of those facilities for the benefits thereby conferred.
If we are going to assess impact fees against new development on the theory that "those who benefit should pay", then the same should apply to worn out facilities. In older parts of town, residences and businesses have direct access to arterial streets, so the benefit can be readily ascertained and assessed, unlike new areas where direct access is prohibited.
(L) Creation of a Street Construction Fund Oversight Board– Consider creation of a citizen board to provide policy direction and management oversight to the City's street construction.
Independent oversight by people with both financial and engineering expertise would be helpful in street construction as it would be for water and sewer. This might help reduce the temptation to use street construction funds for projects which are not getting streets built.
System and Processes
(A) "Design-Build" Bidding Approach
Being very careful to not make the biggest contractors the only game in town. Good concept
Would be okay as an available tool BUT could encourage over building for the sake of cost efficiency without being market driven.
Design-Build legislation for schools has recently been passed by the Legislature, which enables schools to use this form of securing design and construction services. Prior to this legislation there were not Statutes which allowed or prevented Design-Build. I do think it can be a viable option, however one which should be discussed by the Legislative Committee
Don't know the pros and cons
I don't have the knowledge to know if it is worth it
Need more information
Design build limits the number of contractors who can compete. I don't believe you get the best value, because the incentive is to produce the result with the highest return to the design build company. No one is serving as the owner's representative, unless you pay additional for that.
I would like to spend some time on this subject and have city planners input though

This process only seems to work for specialized projects with a very tight schedule such as the Salt Lake Olympics.
Could have many applications
From my experience as a city lobbyist working on this legislation previously, it is obvious that lots of work will be needed to see this passed. I don't believe our committee should waste time discussing an issue better placed within the Legislative Committee.
Insufficient information to form a definite opinion. This seems to make sense, but we have no information on how much might be saved.
(B) "Indefinite Delivery Contract" Approach
Could be useful, but again, be cautious
This concept makes good sense and appeals to me as a business person. We use this approach in conjunction with (C) below for the engineering and installation of nearly 100% of the infrastructure installed in (Ridge/Southview) our subdivisions. Kent may want to delete this identification.
Indefinite Delivery for design services is different than for construction services and would have to be evaluated separately. Having been involved in the Design Build Legislation for School this issue would involve a great deal of time and effort, and may not be one this committee would have time for.
Don't know the pros and cons
These would need to be reviewed frequently to assure the best prices are given.
Need more information
As long as there is incentive to do the best design and best construction, this would work. But if it gets to a "low bid" mentality, then the cheap will always win out and we will end up with low standards and underbuild infrastructure.
More time needed discussing this topic
This works for routine contracts. The problem is that very few contracts are routine.
Sounds reasonable. It would be interesting to see the savings quantified based on this idea. How would this affect the city's ability to broaden it's contractor base (i.e. women & minority owned businesses)?
As long as this is not the only method used in obtaining proposals, I understand that for large projects this could save time and money.
(C) Aggregate Construction Projects in a Single Bid
There are some cost savings and quality of construction benefits that can be realized by grouping several construction projects into a single contract.
Don't know the pros and cons
Seems to make sense
Need more information
This would require large companies, many who are not in Lincoln. There is little incentive to do good work if you complete the work and return to your out-of-state home.
This needs discussing - not too clear on this topic, but sounds interesting anytime you can put more than 1 project together. I think it could be more efficient? Need pros and cons to this
This would tend to discourage "startup" or small contractors and reduce competition.
The county does this every year
(D) Advanced Acquisition of Right of Way (ROW) Along Arterial Corridors
Very important. Get it in advance to save money and add future flexibility
Very important to buy ROW at agricultural prices if market driven and well thought out in advance. The dollar savings could be even more significant if concept could be combined or coordinated with the county and state. While I abhor the potential for unlawful takings, the right of eminent domain may be worthy of further consideration in combination with this concept with full assurances of due process.
Makes sense to look into this

I don't see the downside of this except we have to come up with the money now to buy up the land. I do think we'll get it cheaper the quicker we buy it though.
All of these (D, E, F) are important and should be discussed, but I am not in favor of adding any new staff to accomplish ROW. I would like to look at ways we can achieve our goal without added expenses. We would have to look at the scenarios to see which way would be most cost saving. Maybe retraining current personnel or re-routing duties?
It seems to me that the comp plan gives us a basis to start acquiring ROW
Based on our discussions to date, this seems like a vital part of furthering development in Lincoln. It also seems that all parties agree that acquiring ROW in advance of development will prevent disruption and further construction in the future
ROW acquisition is a relatively small part of most street projects where at least 100' of ROW has been acquired through the subdivision process. In new areas, a very high % of ROW is dedicated at no cost to the city. However, where the county is acquiring ROW for its use outside the city, the city should be providing funding to buy the additional 20' it wants for future streets.
(E) Right-of-Way Acquisition Policy
Whatever policies that slow this process down must be streamlined.
Construction plans need to developed well in advance of right of way acquisition activities. Some of these activities are governed by law and take time and resources.
Makes sense to look into this
This sounds good. Don't know enough of the policies to say.
Often dictated by State or Federal policies. These policies came about because of widespread poor treatment of landowners.
Anything that speeds up the process is good.
Sounds like a great idea. How do we do it?
(F) Increase City's Right-of-Way Acquisition Staff and Resources
We don't need more individuals just better processes.
An increase in staff may be warranted.
Need more information
I don't remember this coming from the committee. I'm not sure the answer is always additional staff. What about contracting some of this?
Resources could come from the private sector.
The issue is not to hire more staff, but to motivate existing staff to be more efficient
We are facing a budget shortfall. It seems unlikely that these positions will be filled, especially in an election year. While we're at it, let's fund more police, planners, building & safety inspectors, road maintenance and snow plow operators.
(G) Platting Procedure Efficiencies
Worth looking at
Engineers say that planning needs to be more flexible for "good cause".
The review process could be shortened significantly saving both time and money. An increase in the number of staff in this area is needed.
Only "time" problems seem to be with changes and waivers. Non-issue to me.
Don't know specifically, but I'm sure this is true.
Again, on items G and H, I think the planning personnel, etc. should have the say in this. They know what works best and are paid to make the best choice. We could do a brief discussion on this topic to just see what it all involves.
Sounds like something to look into.
yes, current procedures do not allow for concurrent items to proceed on the same plat

I am not familiar with current procedures. I would like to see subcommittees examine ideas like this and report to the whole group.
This may be outside the scope of our work. Clearly the process could be speeded up, but the impact on infrastructure costs would be somewhat difficult to gauge.
(H) "Pro Rata Ordinance" Policy
Don't know enough about this
Need a level playing field for developers and all properties should pay their fair share. Will ultimately lower land acquisition costs and home lot prices to ultimate purchaser.
Wouldn't this go away with the implementation of impact fees?
Isn't this impact fee related
Need more information
Don't know what this means.
Because we are assuming impact fees, this is not a 3. Setting aside impact fees would make this important.
Impact fees were to eliminate this???
(I) City Inspection Program
Be tough on violations
Don't try to fix something that's already working okay.
I don't have any experience with the City inspectors, and therefore not comments.
Staff time is wasted checking things that should have been done. This time should be reimbursed by "non-compliant" contractors. One case in point: Easthart Homeowners Association has been working since Sept. 01 to get drainage problems on commons area up to preliminary plat requirements.
I've found City Inspectors to be overzealous and not terribly informed about construction methodology, at least not enough to make this type of judgment.
I'm not sure city inspection is up to par
This would only be important if we were interested in stopping growth. Besides, they don't inspect. They observe.
My knowledge of the few problems that have occurred in the past is limited. However, if it saves money or improves the quality of development, it is worth discussing.
What's wrong with what contractors do now?
(J) Expand Use of City Grant Writing Program to Secure Additional Capital Funds
Use if the potential for more grants is available
May be okay. Need to know more about cost vs. benefit.
This is an area that is always worth looking into.
33rd and Sherman roundabout was apparently built with DOR safety funds. Is there more of this type of funding we are NOT getting. Omaha certainly doesn't seem to lack funds for large scale projects.
If we're not doing this, I have no idea why not.
Yes!
This would not be helpful in growth areas.
I think grant funds become "entitlements" to certain groups, which bloats our city budget because elected officials have a hard time disappointing those with an investment in such programs. How will we do this, when the City's grant writing program consists of a single individual in the Parks & Recreation Department?
(K) Inter-Agency Communication and Coordination
Coordination is always important
Always room for better communication. Last week, just narrowly avoided a disastrous event at So. 84th & Pioneer Greens subdivision.

Improved communication and coordination increased the efficiency of any organization, it's just difficult to achieve
.
Examples heard were problems on Pine Lake Road 14th to 27th when roads and signals weren't in place prior to schools going in and the constant work on south 84th. this list should include Lincoln Public Schools and other non-city/county entities like UNL who have own agenda
Duh???
This is good. Communication - maybe some ideas could be shared that can be used by all.
Great idea!
I don't know how you can do more. Currently, 16 sets of plans are required with any zoning application to be sent out for review.
Sounds great. How do we do it?
Too often streets torn up several times in short time period for different projects
(L) Put More Responsibility for Construction Drawings on Private Engineers
Systems now is 1st in 1st out so incomplete drawings are being submitted causing more city time for review and slowing of process by weeks or months. Private engineers are held responsible in end anyway
Infrastructure Elements
(A) Size of Major Water Distribution Mains Within the Urban Area
Always good to review long standing policies
Discussion must occur as inadvertent prejudices and biases can affect result.
This gets into the practice of engineering and design and would require specific education, technical training and experience in the application of engineering practices and the understanding of engineering sciences. A great deal of professional knowledge of engineering sciences was used in the development of the City's design policies, standards and specifications. However it may be beneficial for the committee to gain a better understanding of the life cycle cost associated with the City's design criteria
This could be done by oversight board
Need more information
I assume this is being done, but if it's not, let's look.
Here again, A, B, C, D, E - this needs to be decided by those we employ to make these decisions. They have the expertise. I think this would be a waste of our time.
I believe they currently do a great job. Standards in engineering have been developed by doing thorough research.
I don't know why they wouldn't be doing this already.
It seems like a worthwhile discussion, with the right individuals. This item should be discussed by an expert subcommittee that reports back to the group.
If smaller mains could be used, money could be saved, but we have little if any information on this point. These assumptions must be conservative to assure adequate flow for peak usage.
(B) Pipe Materials for Distribution mains in Urban Areas
There may be something better at less cost
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
This could be done by oversight board
Need more information
I don't know again if there is a better way, but let's ask the questions.
City has a pipe policy that allows use of different materials. It is the contractors that choose what to use
Not necessarily
Less expensive materials could also save money

(C) Size of Major Wastewater Collection Mains within the Urban Area
Discussion must occur to assure complete objectivity
This could be done by oversight board
Need more information
I assume this is being done, but if it's not, let's look.
Once again I believe the Engineers know what they are doing.
Too technical for this committee
Based on information shared at our meetings, the assumptions used are fairly standard. These assumptions must be conservative to assure adequate flow for peak usage
(D) Pipe Materials for Collection mains in Urban Area
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
This could be done by oversight board
Need more information
I don't know again if there is a better way, but let's ask the questions.
City has a pipe policy that allows use of different materials. It is the contractors in there bidding process that choose what to use
Too technical
Less expensive materials could also save money.
(E) Single mains vs. Parallel Mains
Could be significant
In some respect, this is the same scenario as temporary short term lift stations. Don't over build drainage basins if not market driven by developers and purchasers.
This could be done by oversight board
Need more information
Sounds reasonable, but I'm not sure.
Chances of saving any money are very slim.
Probably only important in Steven's career
This is worth reviewing, but cost savings are likely to be modest, because of limited circumstances where parallel mains would save.
(F) Material and Construction Standards for Streets
These were developed by experts, but a second look could not hurt, just don't go "cheap"
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
A small change in specs might result in large cost-savings
Need more information
Again, let's look and ask.
We have city personnel that work with these materials. I trust they pick the best that will give us the longest life of our streets.
This is only a good idea if we improve the product. We don't want to cheapen it.
Yes, but will public works listen
These standards should be reviewed periodically. More savings could probably be realized on local streets than arterials.
(G) Width of Driving and Turning Lanes
I do not like narrow lanes, they may cost more (12 ft.) but I don't want constriction on busy streets
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
This gets into traffic engineering issues, the level of service of the roadway, capacity issues, etc. which need to be considered when looking at the life of the facility.

Can we have separate standards for existing arterials?
Qualify this to "existing rehab-ed arterials" ONLY in the build environment (roughly the area from Hwy. 2 to Cornhusker, 7th or 8th to 70th). These roads/neighborhoods were not designed for higher speed thru traffic. There are driveways, kids cross arterials and walk to school in established neighborhoods. The safety and societal costs which cannot be quantified in any AASHTO guide must be a part of the economic picture.
(Ped safety advocates know that more accidents and higher speeds occur on wider streets. Even NHTSA has been interested in studying the correlation between lane width and accident stats. A study done in Colorado "residential street typology and accident statistics" reached similar conclusions.)
I'm not sure we are going to save a lot of money without sacrificing traffic time and safety.
This is only a good idea where there are space restrictions such as on East "O" around 56th street. No reason to do this on construction in new areas. A lot of research has been done on lane widths. 12-foot lanes have been proven to be best if there are no space restrictions.
Based on the discussions I have heard at our meetings, this is a reduction in quality.
(H) Dual Left Turn Lanes on Future Arterials
Should be reviewed, depending on projected numbers
Some discussion may be appropriate.
If the question is cost efficiency and the ultimate "need" is for dual lefts, the ROW should be there. We are retrofitting existing intersections for this design.
I think it's a good thing to look at.
With the adoption of wide medians the cost of dual lefts is minimal.
Yes, dual lefts are not needed in most applications
The creation of and phasing of intersections in new growth areas is worth discussing.
This is a significant point, and could reduce projected costs substantially
(I) Striping Polices
Older neighborhoods are very important BUT is this statement true or just perception?
This sounds more like a safety issue or liability issue.
It's obvious maintenance (as in sidewalks and crumbling curbs and streets) is not keeping up
We need to keep our existing neighborhoods safe, and striping is such a minimal cost.
We need to review how often striping takes place. This could be a safety issue.
Not important
I would love to see this addressed. However, I do not think it applies to our committee's charge.
(J) Costs for Retaining Wall
Review
Worthy of moderate discussion only.
The cost of right of way cost compared to the cost of retaining walls needs to be considered during preliminary design of the roadway or street. This needs to occur prior to or in conjunction with the design of any proposed development
Need more information
This seems to be excessive, especially with the wide ROW.
This could be looked at. We may not need retaining walls.
These cost items are important because the public works department is not using realistic costs
This is a concrete example of possible cost reductions. I think it is worth discussion.
This has good potential for lowering estimated costs. Using costs from projects like 70th or 84th streets will exaggerate the estimate due to the narrower existing ROW available.
(K) Traffic and Pedestrian Signal Assumptions

Review
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
The need for traffic signals or pedestrian crosswalks needs to follow criteria established in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and be a project cost. I do not believe the 3.5 signals per mile and 1 pedestrian crossing per mile is a policy, but merely an estimate.
Who will pay if they are eventually needed?
These assumptions by city seem excessive
There are requests by businesses and residents for more signals which do not need warrants. If they are put in they have to be paid for by someone. The developer can pass the cost on to those businesses and rooftops that create the need.
I'm curious how this would affect public safety.
I don't like reducing signals. I believe this is a safety issue also
The lower ratio that currently exists doesn't take into account the signals that are warranted but not built because of a lack of city funds.
These cost assumptions are important because it reflects an improvement standard that does not exist today
A more realistic assumption here would be helpful. As was pointed out at one of our meetings, we have not reached this level of signalization on very many existing streets, most of which are in areas which have been built up for decades.
(L) Developer Contributions to Arterial Street Projects
Important
Certainly a valid concern that must be taken into consideration.
Wouldn't this go away with the implementation of impact fees?
Should look
I have no idea about this one.
Needs to be discussed.
This issue would be dealt with if we had an oversight board for streets
I am a strong believer in impact fees. The idea of asking developers to pay for part of these infrastructure developments is very appealing.
(M) Sureties for Sidewalks and Street Trees along Arterial Street
Old subject with much waste. Make home contractor perform prior to granting Occupancy Permit. 2nd part – must be considered in cost only once.
I believe this should be a project cost associated with street improvements perform by the City.
Sureties are extremely important!
These are a necessary part of development and Lincoln's quality of life. What are issues?
I'm not sure how well this works. I think it's more of a pain and allows the City to keep money long after it really should.
Lets include these costs in the initial contribution by the developer. Then build with the whole project.
This is not necessary if we have impact fees
I have seen the paperwork involved in releasing these sureties and it seems excessive. However, there must be some guarantee for proper installation. I would need to see an alternative.
These items should be removed from the cost projections, or from the required improvements in the subdivision ordinance—one or the other.
(N) Costs for Burying LES Lines
Review
LES and City general funds should pay for existing or old on 50/50 basis and developer for new(currently developer does this.)

I don't have any experience with the City inspectors, and therefore not comments.
Lines should be buried in existing areas and not just new. A schedule of how this can be achieved over the next 20 to 30 years should be created.
Lines SHOULD be buried but I'm not sure who and how it should be paid for.
Would like to discuss this.
Need to have a fuller discussion of this item
It is worth exploring, if it results in cost savings.
(O) Reimbursement of LES Costs
Review
LES must budget and pay for these improvements through rate structure and split as described in (N) above.
I don't have any experience with the City inspectors, and therefore not comments.
Need more information
This sounds convoluted, but I'm not sure I understand. Simpler is always better, I do believe that.
This needs discussion. Sounds kind of cumbersome in policy. Why does this have to be done this way? And maybe this should come out of LES budget?
This sounds like a lot of paperwork, which can translate into a great cost.
(P) Building Urban Streets as a Final Cross Section
I need more information
Must be discussed further. Don't over build or waste county/city/state dollars inefficiently and without full amortization of earlier expenditures.
This seems to be one of the biggest areas of potential savings, especially if constructed as described in "Q"
Need to hear the pros and cons of this. I would think it depends on the projected completion of any of the development. If development is to be, let's say completed in 4 years and the road lasts for 10, then build the 4-lane traffic is always so bad in areas that are being developed because of equipment, etc.
We need to build what is needed now and add in the future
Based on our previous committee discussions, this is a great concern to the community. I believe it is a crucial item that we must address during our study.
Cost savings could be substantial if construction is deferred. Some "free" use of good county roads for a period of time has served us well in the past, and with proper planning for improvements as they are needed, would ease the budget crunch.
(Q) Construction Phasing for Urban Cross Sections
Sounds logical
Don't second guess the best judgment of the City's professionals.
Not sure on this. Need clarification
Worth considering.
This is another concrete example of facility development that could result in cost savings.
Building 2 lanes, with curb and gutter and storm sewer would facilitate future addition of more lanes without closing the street.

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\CSE worksheets.123